

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/672,602	ELLISON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kaveh Abrishamkar	2131	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Kaveh Abrishamkar.

(3) _____.

(2) Thinh Nguyen (Reg. No. 42,034).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 January 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

102 and 103 rejections in view of England (U.S. Patent No. 6,327, 652) and Ermolovich (U.S. Patent 4,319,323)

Claims discussed:

1-2, 21-22, 41-42, 61-62

Prior art documents discussed:

England (U.S. Patent No. 6,327, 652) and Ermolovich (U.S. Patent 4,319,323)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Applicant was advised that claims 2,22,42,and 62 would be allowable if re-written in an independent form as the claims define the isolated digests defined in the independent claims 1,21,41, and 61. This proposed amendment was later approved by the Applicant.